

## Summary of Public Comments

**ROMA/CALTHORPE TEAM - Page 1 of 2**

Strengths	Weaknesses
-----------	------------

### **1. Vision, Outcomes and Understanding Specific Plan:**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good knowledge of issues</li> <li>• Strong on new ideas for work places, jobs and housing</li> <li>• Can deliver results</li> <li>• Very experienced</li> <li>• Good ideas on phasing, working with developers, and market to create new places.</li> <li>• Had good points</li> <li>• Great understanding of land use issues and challenges</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focused more on built environment than on natural environment and opportunities.</li> <li>• Little focus on Coyote demonstrated</li> <li>• Very self-absorbed presentation</li> <li>• Too much focus on past projects</li> <li>• Not enough focus on environment</li> <li>• Did not demonstrate understanding of financial objectives, jobs/housing balance, or triggers.</li> </ul> |
|--|---|

### **Other Comments:**

- No discussion of the specifics

### **2. Overall Project Approach:**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very organized, obvious experts!</li> <li>• Good graphics and examples</li> <li>• Great visuals and communication tools</li> <li>• Great on public outreach and communication</li> <li>• Obviously good on very large and diverse projects with many stakeholders</li> <li>• Great vision!</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not enough green space in their project examples</li> <li>• No real vision for Valley</li> <li>• Didn't cover methodology or approach</li> <li>• Implementation and plan end products not addressed</li> </ul> |
|--|---|

### **3. Quality of Presentation:**

#### **a. Organization:**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong organizational skills</li> <li>• Good experience and very organized</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Speakers sat down and did not address whole group</li> <li>• Panel displays not structurally viable</li> </ul> |
|--|---|

#### **b. Substantive Content:**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appreciated demographic shift</li> <li>• Mixed use, sustainability, and jobs/housing balance were well addressed</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Didn't present new ideas</li> <li>• Didn't address end products</li> </ul> |
|--|---|

## Summary of Public Comments

### ROMA/CALTHORPE TEAM - Page 2 of 2

	Strengths	Weaknesses
<b><u>c. Graphic Content:</u></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nice computer graphics and presentation</li> <li>• Good experience and very organized</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May be world-renowned, but may not be thinking outside the box---relied too much existing built projects</li> </ul>

#### **4. General Comments:**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very experienced &amp; extensive experience with mixed use development</li> <li>• Good energy and enthusiasm</li> <li>• Strong team</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bay Meadows community may not be happy with plan and didn't have much involvement with it</li> <li>• Very strong on project vision</li> <li>• Overall did not have a vision for the Valley</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The projects cited may not be applicable</li> <li>• Some of their principal team members did present or attend</li> <li>• Didn't care for projects they referenced</li> </ul>
---	--	--